

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

RETISH VIKASH SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

B. SCOTT, et al.,

Respondent.

CASE NO. 3:24-cv-05547-BHS-BAT

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
COUNSEL, DKT. 5.**

Petitioner moves for appointment of counsel in this 28 U.S.C. § 2241 immigration habeas action. Dkt. 5. There is no right to have counsel appointed in § 2241 cases unless an evidentiary hearing is required. *See Terravona v. Kincheloe*, 852 F.2d 424, 429 (9th Cir. 1988); *Brown v. Vasquez*, 952 F.2d 1164, 1168 (9th Cir. 1992). Where an evidentiary hearing is not required, the Court may appoint counsel for a financially eligible petitioner where the “interests of justice so require.” 18 U.S.C. § 3006A.

The Court finds Petitioner has presently failed to demonstrate the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel. The lengthy and detailed pleadings for relief that Plaintiff has filed show he is quite able to clearly articulate his claims. If the Court determines an evidentiary hearing is necessary, it will appoint counsel at that time, assuming Petitioner is still financially eligible.

1 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Petitioner's motion to appoint counsel. Dkt. 5. The  
2 Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to Petitioner.

3 DATED this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2024.

4  
5 

6 

---

BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA  
United States Magistrate Judge